

7

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks following is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-33 are pending in this case, claims 34-44 having been previously withdrawn under a restriction requirement as drawn to a non-elected invention. Claims 1-33 have been rejected.

By this amendment, claims 1-33 have been cancelled. Claims 45-56 have been added.

Attached hereinabove is a marked up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment.

Claim Objections – 37 CFR 1.75(c)

The Examiner has objected to claims 4 and 6 as being of improper dependent form. Claims 4 and 6 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

The examiner has rejected claims 1-8 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gagnan (2,700,876). Claims 1-8 and 16-17 have been cancelled.

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 9, 11, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Elliott et al. (3,963,377). Claims 1, 9, 11, 13, and 15 have been cancelled.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-9, 13-14, 18-19, 21, and 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stanford (4,673,415). Claims 1-9, 13-14, 18-19, 21, and 30-33 have been cancelled.

The examiner has rejected claims 18, 21-22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tomoiu (5,807,083). Claims 18, 21-22, and 24 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

The examiner has rejected claims 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gagnan in view of Schuman et al. (5,993,172) and Eggleston (862,867). Claims 9-14 have been cancelled.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 18, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gagnan in view of Stanford. Claims 1-4, 18, and 20 have been cancelled.

The examiner has rejected claims 23 and 25-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomoiu. Claims 23 and 25-29 have been cancelled.

New Claims

New claims 45-55 have been provided.

Support for claims 45-52 and for claim 56 is to be found primarily in the discussion of Figure 7, between page 56 line 9 and page 57 line 19 of the instant application. Support for claims 53-55 is to be found primarily in the discussion of Figure 8, between page 58 line 1 and page 61 line 9.

The prior art clearly fails to teach a gas supply module for supplying compressed gas to a gas utilizing application which comprises a first refillable gas supply unit operable to be filled through a first input portal with a first pressurized gas at a first pressure, and further operable to supply said first gas to the gas utilizing application at a second pressure when a fluid pressurizer supplies a pressurizing fluid pressurized to said second pressure at a second input portal of said refillable gas supply unit.

9

In view of the above amendments and remarks, acceptance of new claims 45-56 is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Sol Sheinbein

Registration No. 25,457

Date: July 13, 2004.

Encl.:

A three months extension fee; and
Drawings.